



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

turity—in which it was cut down by Rome—came in the Macedonian time.” The imperial tendency had from the beginning to contend vainly with the obstinate separatism of the Greek city states. Neither Athens nor Sparta, nor—least of all—Thebes, was able to convert its hegemonies into permanent empires; and when some sort of unification had become essential, with characteristic conservatism the Greek people struggled against the inevitable. According to Professor Ferguson’s view there were two rival solutions of the central political problem. These were the federal systems of which the city-state was originally the unit, and the deification of rulers.

Both Plato and Aristotle almost inevitably failed to see the necessary trend of civilization: Plato because he was obsessed by the attempt “to mend city constitutions when the world required the creation of larger territorial states”; Aristotle because, although he noted in one passage of the *Politics* that “if the Greeks were united in a single polity they would be capable of universal empire,” he considered such a consummation the reverse of desirable, expressly excepting the city-state from the rule that the stronger must rule the weaker. With Alexander, the work of empire-building began in earnest, and it is he who first makes use of the device of deification. Just as he required the form of salutation called *proskynesis* from his followers present in person, so he required from distant cities the acknowledgment of his godhead. Such acknowledgment, then, was “the *proskynesis* of cities.”

Whether or not too much stress is laid by the author upon this device of deification as a means of evading and at the same time sanctioning imperial government, is the controversial point, if there is one, in the book. Certainly the expedient would seem to have been adopted in the first place by Alexander chiefly for the sake of its effect upon his Asiatics, and it is perhaps a question whether in Hellas proper it did him more harm or good. If the rough Macedonian soldiers could joke about “the son of Jupiter,” it is hard to think of the cultivated Athenian of the period as being much impressed, and at a later date Demetrius Poliorcetes indulged in some not very seemly jesting about his “sister Athene.” But perhaps the want of reverence in particular cases is exactly what proves the value of the thing in its more general significance; for the deification of rulers would not be the first or last device which men have resolved to take seriously in a public sense, while privately mocking at it.

Professor Ferguson requires us to use some historic imagination—to view the development of thought on political subjects more or less apart from the views held at a particular time by any one thinker. The philosophy of history is not an easy subject in which to reach assured convictions, yet Professor Ferguson’s conclusions are not merely suggestive, but satisfactorily convincing. He pilots us safely and with an exhilarating sense of progress, through a period full of dangers to the inexperienced navigator.

---

THE MESSAGE OF GREEK ART. By H. H. POWERS, Ph.D., PRESIDENT OF THE BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Without professing to write what may be regarded in any sense as a

history of Greek art, Dr. Powers has produced an excellent tonic book suitable for general reading and not unfitted for use in colleges and secondary schools. Sensible and timely is the plea for the value of things Greek as distinguished from a knowledge of the Greek language. Truly, Homer in translation is little like Homer in the original; but long and dusty is the road that leads through *mi*-verbs and manifold rules of syntax to a real appreciation of Greek style, and few there be that travel it to the end. Lamentably few, we may believe; yet it is unquestionably true that no linguistic barrier should be raised between the student and the lessons that Greek life has to teach.

The scientific preoccupation of our age, Dr. Powers believes, has led to a great deal of art-study which brings results of much the same nature as a recruiting officer's examination of an applicant for enlistment. The officer acquires a sort of anthropological knowledge of the man which the man's nearest friends do not possess; but his *acquaintance* with the applicant is nil. Acquaintance, as the word is understood between friends, should be the immediate quest in a study of Greek art. "Such a quest," continues Dr. Powers, "is not unscientific, for it allows the fullest place to exact knowledge, but it involves some things in addition which exact knowledge cannot furnish, just as a fireside acquaintance with a person involves things quite outside the measurement of the recruit."

In this spirit the whole book is effectively written. In his enthusiasm for Greek culture the author acknowledges himself a bit of an extremist: he avows that he is one of those who are inclined to attribute to the Greeks an absolute intellectual supremacy, considering that in those matters in which we seem to have bested them our superiority is merely a superiority of *plant* and of accumulated knowledge. With such statements as that "in Athens, for a century or two, life scored its most notable successes," we may have little quarrel; but when we meet the assertion that "Greek slavery was a thing of sweetness and light compared to our own," we shall think perhaps of that rural client of Lysias, who, after causing one of his slaves to be bound and thrown into a ditch, where the man subsequently died, drove off to town without apparent consciousness of having done anything reprehensible or even unusual.

Perhaps, again, the author speaks with too much confidence of social conditions in the prehistoric Grecian world, adopting without reserve the view that the Homeric poems picture a state of affairs in which the magnificence of an overthrown Ægean civilization is artlessly contrasted with the rude pioneer habits of the conquering race. Yet in the sort of brief, eloquent discussion which is all that Dr. Powers attempts, it is of course impracticable to view every side of a question. The book is written with imagination and verve, and, this side of the merely fanciful, nothing could be farther than its method and treatment from the dry-as-dust and perfunctory. The style runs to the racy idioms of every day; barbarous technicalities are dropped and translations of Greek terms are preferred to mere transliterations.

On the whole, Dr. Powers succeeds in his attempt to show the arts—pottery, sculpture, and to some extent architecture—with civilization as a background. His treatment of such mooted points as the painting of

Greek statues is governed by common sense and a readiness to see that the Greeks, for all their subtlety, were not so super-subtle as some of their apologists; nor does his admiration for Greek intellect lead him into approval of Polyclitus and his canon. His discussion of such general questions as that relating to the nude in art shows a general knowledge of artistic conventions coupled with an independence of thought that renounces mere studio traditions. Moreover, his frequent assaults upon literal-mindedness are refreshing.

*The Message of Greek Art* is adequately illustrated with pictures of more or less familiar specimens of art and architecture, from the Lion Gate of Mycenæ to the Farnese Bull and the Laocoön.

---

A SHORT HISTORY OF ART. By JULIA B. DE FORREST. EDITED AND REVISED BY CHARLES HENRY CAFFIN. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1913.

Doubtless revision will prolong the life of a generally sound, useful, and moderately readable, but not very inspiring book. The revision, we may conjecture, has been more thorough as regards the latter than the earlier part of the treatise. At any rate, in the opening chapters some rather strange-sounding sentences stand. The Trojan War is referred to as a determinable period, and "800 years after the death of Theseus" is regarded as a satisfactory date.

Such minor details are not, to be sure, of much consequence in a history of art; but the book shares in a defect of most histories of the kind, from M. Reinach's little *Apollo* (which is little more than an admirable catalogue) to works of more pretension than the one under consideration: the treatise is almost purely descriptive; there is little of the evolution of art—little of cause and effect, and that little far from conclusive. We are not satisfied with such explanations as that regarding the characteristic differences between Egyptian and Mesopotamian sculpture: "The need of holding what they [the Mesopotamians] had gained against others obliged them to keep themselves in a constant condition of vigor and alertness. Thus the type of figure represented in their sculpture differs from that of the Egyptians, being characterized by muscular development and more energy of action." This, if not far-fetched, seems certainly inadequate. Again the fascinating study of cause and effect in Greek architecture receives very scant treatment. Allowance must be made, of course, for the limitations imposed by the cyclopedic scope of the work, yet it seems that the relation between art and life might have been more clearly brought out here and there. In reading, for instance, of the Pre-Raphaelites as described in this volume, one would hardly guess what a stir and rummage in the land was caused by this school. Throughout the book, the descriptions are characterized by a kind of bare, dry adequacy, and statements about artists and their work are eminently conservative, not to say conventional. By way of offset, there is considerable quotation from good authorities, historical or critical, though the source of the quotation is not always clearly indicated.

The book has an abundant selection of fairly representative illustrations. It is a trustworthy and comprehensive treatise—by no means an ideal history of art.